REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-59 are pending in the application. In this reply, Claim 47 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 48, and Claim 48 has been cancelled. Thus, the amendments herein should not necessitate a new search, as no previously unrecited subject matter has been introduced into the Claims that was not already present. The issues within the Office Action will now be addressed in their order of appearance.

Claims 1-11, 14, 19-20, 22-32, 35, 40-41, 43-51, 53-57, and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Application No. 2004/0088715 to Korall (Office Action, Page 4, Paragraph 2). The rejections of Claims 1, 43, and 47 are respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

To assist in the examination process, the amended version of Claim 47 is listed below.

47.   A computer implemented method comprising the computer-
            implemented steps of:
receiving, at a database server that is executing on a second node in
            a distributed system, a message that (a) was transmitted by
            a first node in the distributed system and (b) subsequently
            had appended thereon information describing an event; and
thereon information describing an event;
retrieving the information describing the event from the local node
            where said event occurred; and
invoking concurrency control techniques to control concurrent
            access to a shared-memory event buffer from processes that
            propagate messages to subscriber nodes and processes that
            generate events.

Claim 47 has been amended to recite, inter alia, invoking concurrency control techniques, which was originally recited in Claim 48. Such a feature is neither shown nor suggested in Korall. Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, expressly or under principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed

invention. RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440, 1444, 221 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 385, 388 (Fed. Cir.).

The portions of Korall (Paragraphs [0028] through [0048]) relied upon by the Office Action (Page 4, Paragraph 3) to anticipate these elements do not disclose the elements whatsoever, either expressly, by inherency, or in any context. In rejecting a claim, the grounds of that rejection must be fully and clearly stated. See MPEP § 707.07(d).

For at least the above reasons, the rejection of Claim 47, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, is invalid and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 43 recite, inter alia, detecting an occurrence of one or more subsequent events at the first node of the system; and determining that the information about the initial event is identical to the information about said one or more subsequent events. Such a feature is not disclosed or suggested in Korall.

Regarding the context of the embodiment recited in Claims 1 and 43, it must be considered that the creation of messages by a computer system is an expensive process, slowing down the clustered system and adding more traffic to the network that is used for communication between clustered systems. Although the size of an event notification may be small, event notifications can use a significant amount of bandwidth on a network if there are many of them. By "detecting an occurrence of one or more subsequent events at the first node of the system; and determining that the information about the initial event is identical to the information about said one or more subsequent events" as well as the other recited steps, a very tangible efficiency can be realized. Overhead associated with message delivery has been saved, thereby achieving the result of event notification in such a way that uses less processing power and network resources.

For at least the above reasons, the rejection of Claims 1 and 43, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, is invalid and should be withdrawn.

14

OID-2002-117-01

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone or e-mail if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application. As per MPEP Chapter 5, Applicant understands that Internet communications may not be secure.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

/christophermtanner#41518/

Dated: January 27, 2008   _____

                                                     Chris Tanner
                                                     Reg. No. 41,518

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
ctanner@hptb-law.com
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1238
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

OID-2002-117-01